arXiv:cond-mat/0511078v1 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 3 Nov 2005

Electric field control of spin transport

Sangeeta Sahoo*, Takis Kontos*, Jürg Furer, Christian Hoffmann
Matthias Gräber, Audrey Cottet & Christian Schönenberger

Institut für Physik, Universität Basel, Klingelbergstrasse 82, CH-4056 Basel, Switzerland.

*These authors contributed equally to this work
Correspondence should be addressed to C.S.; E-mail: Christian.Schönenberger@unibas.ch

Spintronics is an approach to electronics in which the spin of the electrons is exploited to control the electric resistance R of devices [1–3]. One basic building block is the spin-valve [4–6], which is formed if two ferromagnetic electrodes are separated by a thin tunneling barrier. In such devices, R depends on the orientation of the magnetisation of the electrodes. It is usually larger in the antiparallel than in the parallel configuration. The relative difference of R, the so-called magneto-resistance (MR), is then *positive*. Common devices, such as the giant magneto-resistance sensor used in reading heads of hard disks [7,8], are based on this phenomenon. The MR may become anomalous (*negative*) [9], if the transmission probability of electrons through the device is spin or energy dependent [3]. This offers a route to the realisation of gate-tunable MR devices [10,11], because transmission probabilities can readily be tuned in many devices with an electrical gate signal. Such devices have, however, been elusive so far. We report here on a pronounced gate-field controlled MR in devices made from carbon nanotubes with ferromagnetic contacts. Both the amplitude *and* the sign of the MR are tunable with the gate voltage in a predictable manner.

Early work on spin transport in multi-wall carbon nanotubes (MWNTs) with Co contacts showed that spins could propagate coherently over distances as long as $250\,\mathrm{nm}$ [12]. The tunnel magneto-resistance $TMR = (R_{AP} - R_P)/R_P$, defined as the relative difference between the resistances R_{AP} and R_P in the antiparallel (AP) and parallel (P) magnetisation configuration, was found to be positive and amounted to $+4\,\%$ in agreement with Jullière's formula for tunnel junctions [4,13]. A negative TMR of about $-30\,\%$ was reported later for MWNTs contacted with similar Co contacts [14]. In these experiments, the nanotubes did not exhibit a quantum dot (Qdot) behaviour. It has been shown, however, that single-wall carbon nanotubes (SWNTs) and MWNTs contacted with non-ferromagnetic metals could behave as Qdots and Fabry-Perot resonators [15–19], in which one can tune the position of discrete energy levels with a gate electrode. From this, one can expect to be able to tune the sign and the amplitude of the TMR in nanotubes, in a similar fashion as predicted originally for semiconductor heterostructures [11].

In this letter, we report on TMR measurements of multi-wall and single-wall carbon nanotubes that are contacted with ferromagnetic electrodes and capacitively coupled to a back-gate [20]. A typical sample geometry is shown in the inset of Fig. 1. As a result of resonant tunneling, we observe a striking oscillatory amplitude and sign modulation of the TMR as a function of the gate voltage. We have studied and observed the TMR on 9 samples (7 MWNTs and 2 SWNTs) with various tube lengths L between the ferromagnetic electrodes (see methods). We present here results for one MWNT device and one SWNT device.

We first discuss the results of the MWNT device. Figure 1 displays single traces of the linear response resistance R as a function of the magnetic field H at $1.85\,\mathrm{K}$ for two sweep directions and four different gate voltages V_g. For all cases, the characteristic hysteretic behaviour of a spin valve appears. Upon sweeping the magnetic field from $-500\,\mathrm{mT}$ to $500\,\mathrm{mT}$, the configuration gets antiparallel (AP) between $0\,\mathrm{mT}$ and $100\,\mathrm{mT}$, whereas it is always parallel (P) for $|H| > 100\,\mathrm{mT}$. At $V_g = -3.1\,\mathrm{V}$ for example, R increases from 49.7 to $51.5\,\mathrm{k}\Omega$ when

the sample switches from the P to the AP configuration. This yields a normal *positive* TMR of $+2.9\,\%$. In contrast, at $V_g = -3.3\,\mathrm{V}$, R switches from $30.5\,\mathrm{k}\Omega$ in the P configuration to a *smaller* resistance of $29.5\,\mathrm{k}\Omega$ in the AP configuration, yielding an anomalous *negative* TMR of $-3.5\,\%$. Therefore, the *sign* of the TMR changes with the gate voltage, demonstrating a gate-field tunable magnetoresistance (MR).

Figure 2a displays the variation of the TMR in a large V_g window of $-5 \ldots 2\,\mathrm{V}$ at $T = 1.85\,\mathrm{K}$. The TMR is observed to oscillate relatively regularly between $-5\,\%$ and $+6\,\%$ on a gate-voltage scale of $\Delta V_g^{TMR} = 0.4 - 0.75\,\mathrm{V}$. Two possible mechanisms may account for oscillations in spin transport: quantum interference [11] and gate-field induced spin-precession via the Rashba spin-orbit interaction [21] proposed by Datta and Das [10]. In the latter case, the spin orbit interaction yields a spin precession which is reflected both in the TMR and the conductance. To lowest order, the spin-precession would lead to a $TMR \propto \cos(2mL\beta_R eV_g/\hbar^2)$, where L is the length of the MWNT, m (e) the electron mass (charge), and β_R the Rashba spin-orbit parameter. However, the measured magnitude of $\Delta V_g^{TMR} \sim 1\,\mathrm{V}$ for one TMR period requires a large $\beta_R \sim 10^{-12}\,\mathrm{m}$. Although a β_R value of this order of magnitude has been reported in semiconductor heterostructures [22], this value is unreasonably large for carbon nanotubes, due to the small spin-orbit interaction of carbon leading to an electron g-factor close to 2 [19,23,24]. We therefore conclude that the mechanism of TMR oscillations is quantum interference instead. To substantiate this, we compare next the TMR gate-voltage scale ΔV_g^{TMR} with the corresponding scale ΔV_g^e for the addition of single electrons.

To resolve single-electron states, the same sample was measured at lower temperatures, i.e. at $T = 300\,\mathrm{mK}$ in a different cryostat which is not suitable for TMR studies. A measurement of the differential conductance dI/dV as a function of source-drain V_{sd} and gate voltage V_g at $T = 300\,\mathrm{mK}$ in a relatively narrow V_g range is shown in Fig. 2b. It displays the diamond-like pattern characteristic for single-electron tunneling in a Qdot. The visible diamonds vary in size

with single electron addition energies ranging between 0.5 and $0.75\,$meV, in agreement with previous reports on MWNT Qdots with non-ferromagnetic leads [19]. Comparing with V_g^{TMR}, we see that the average gate-voltage scale $\Delta V_g^e = 25\,$mV associated to one single particle level is much smaller than ΔV_g^{TMR}. The latter corresponds therefore to the addition of at least 16 electrons rather than 1.

A gate-voltage scale which agrees with the TMR signal becomes visible, if the linear conductance G at low temperatures is monitored over a wider gate-voltage range. This is shown in Fig. 2c. The single-electron conductance peaks are strongly modulated in amplitude, leading to a regular beating pattern with the proper gate-voltage scale of $\Delta V_g \approx 0.4\,$V. Note, the absolute values of V_g cannot be compared with the TMR measurement in Fig. 1a, because the sample was thermally cycled.

Beatings in the amplitude of single-electron resonances are often observed in Qdot structures and attributed to interference modulation due to weak disorder. Indeed, as seen in the dI/dV plot of Fig. 2b, the diamonds do not alternate regularly. In the resonant tunneling model, one expects each single particle peak to contribute negatively to the TMR at sufficiently low temperature. However, as we have measured the TMR at $T = 1.85\,$K, where the single-particle resonances are already strongly averaged out, the TMR is only sensitive to the average over these peaks, yielding a modulation that follows the envelope function of the single-electron peaks.

The final proof that interference of single particle levels is the physical origin for the observed TMR oscillation comes from measurements on single-wall carbon nanotubes (SWNTs). Figure 3 displays the conductance G and the TMR of a SWNT device. The Qdot behaviour is already observed at $1.85\,$K, whereas this was only evident at $0.3\,$K in the MWNT device. This is consistent with the higher energy scales (both single-electron charging energy and level spacing) for SWNTs as compared to MWNTs. As seen in the dI/dV plot of Fig. 3b, the typi-

cal single-electron addition energy amounts to $\sim 5\,$meV, whereas it was an order of magnitude smaller in the MWNT device.

In Fig. 3a, the variation of the linear conductance G and the TMR is simultaneously shown for two resonances. First, we observe that the TMR changes sign on each conductance resonance. Furthermore, we see that the line shape of the conductance resonances is symmetric, whereas that of the TMR dips is asymmetric. The jump in the $G(V_g)$ data at $V_g = 4.325$ is not reproducible, but arises from background charge switching. This jump is absent in a second scan. The amplitude of the TMR ranges from $-7\,\%$ to $+17\,\%$, which is a higher amplitude than for the MWNT samples. We think that this might be due to the higher charging energy in SWNTs [25]. Control experiments on two Normal-SWNT-Ferromagnetic (N-SWNT-F) devices yield an order of magnitude lower signal (see methods and supplementary online material), proving that the current in the F-tube-F devices is indeed spin polarised.

The transmission probability through a Qdot near a resonance can be described by the Breit-Wigner formula. If the Qdot is coupled to two continua with spin-dependent densities of states, the life-time of an electron on the Qdot becomes spin dependent. Therefore, the width of the resonance is different for carriers with up and down spins. In addition, the energy levels E_n of the carbon-nanotube Qdot, acquire a spin-dependent part caused by phases of the reflection amplitudes at the boundaries between the Qdot and the ferromagnetic electrodes, which are spin dependent [26–28]. The spin-dependent Breit-Wigner transmission probability for electrons at energy E with spin orientation σ can conveniently be written as:

$$T_\sigma = \frac{\Gamma_L^\sigma \Gamma_R^\sigma}{(E - E_0^\sigma)^2 + (\Gamma_L^\sigma + \Gamma_R^\sigma)^2/4} \tag{1}$$

where $\Gamma_{L(R)}^\sigma = \gamma_{L(R)}(1 + \sigma P_{L(R)})$ denote the spin-dependent ($\sigma = \pm 1$) coupling to the left (right) ferromagnetic lead, and E_0^σ the spin-dependent energy level of the Qdot. Note, that the polarisation in the leads $P_{L(R)}$ is measured relative to the spin quantisation axis.

The sign change of the TMR can be predicted with Eq. (1), provided the couplings to the leads are asymmetric, see Fig. 4. Off resonance, i.e. if $|E - E_0| \gg (\Gamma_L^\sigma + \Gamma_R^\sigma)$, T_σ is small and $\propto \Gamma_L^\sigma \Gamma_R^\sigma$, yielding the normal positive TMR of $+2P^2/(1-P^2)$ (we assume that $|P_L| = |P_R| = P$). On resonance, on the other hand, $T_\sigma \propto \Gamma_L^\sigma/\Gamma_R^\sigma$, (if e.g. $\Gamma_R^\sigma \gg \Gamma_L^\sigma$), yielding an anomalous negative TMR of $-2P^2/(1+P^2)$. This mechanism has already been suggested to explain an observed anomalous TMR in Ni/NiO/Co nanojunctions [29]. Unlike this earlier work, we are able to follow the conductance and the TMR by tuning the energy level E_0 with the gate-voltage V_g and compare with the model. Whereas the negative TMR can be understood following this line of argument, the explicit shape and in particular the asymmetry in the TMR requires a spin-dependent energy level E_0^σ as we will show now. The eigenstate depends on the gate-voltage *and* on the spin direction: $E_0^\sigma = E_0 - \epsilon_\sigma - \alpha e V_g$, where α is a constant proportional to the gate capacitance, e the unit of charge, and ϵ_σ the spin-dependent part of the energy level. In the limit of small spin polarisation $P_{L(R)} \ll 1$, one may use the ansatz $\epsilon_\sigma = \kappa\sigma(P_L + P_R)$. We treat κ as a fitting parameter, which will be deduced from the experiment. κ determines the asymmetry of the TMR signal.

The solid lines in Fig. 3 show fits to the measured conductance G and the TMR using Eq. (1). As the two resonances are well separated in energy, it is possible to fit them individually. In order to obtain the conductance at finite temperature, we convolved T_σ with the derivative of the Fermi-Dirac distribution at $1.85\,\mathrm{K}$ and sum over σ. The following parameters entered the fits: $P = 0.2$ and $\kappa = 0.32\,\mathrm{meV}$. $\gamma_{L,R}$ differ for the two resonances: $\gamma_L = 0.014\ (0.028)\,\mathrm{meV}$ and $\gamma_R = 0.5\ (0.85)\,\mathrm{meV}$ for the left (right) resonance, respectively. Using these parameters, a very good agreement between theory and experiment is found. Convincing evidence for spin injection in a Qdot is deduced from the observed asymmetric line shape of the TMR in the SWNT device. The spin-imbalance expressed by ϵ_σ is substantial, amounting to as much as $\pm 0.13\,\mathrm{meV}$ which corresponds to an internal 'exchange field' of $B = 2.2\,\mathrm{T}$.

METHODS

Experimental We have developed a reliable scheme to prepare relatively transparent ferromagnetic contacts to MWNTs and SWNTs using the ferromagnetic alloy $Pd_{1-x}Ni_x$ with $x \sim 0.7$ [20]. Applying standard lithography techniques, a single nanotube is connected to two ferromagnetic PdNi electrodes that are further connected to bonding pads via Pd wires. We take advantage of the very good contacting properties of Pd to nanotubes [30] and its giant paramagnetism. We have studied and observed the TMR on 9 samples (7 MWNTs and 2 SWNTs) with various tube lengths $L = 0.4$, 0.5, 0.8, and $1\,\mu$m between the ferromagnetic electrodes. Control samples with Pd and PdNi contacts were fabricated as well, see below under 'Control Experiment'.

Stray-field effect In order to rule out a simple stray-field effect, we compare the high-field magneto-resistance S (defined as a $\%$ change of the resistance per T) with the low-field hysteretic TMR signal. First, we see that the magnitude of the TMR signal of the curves shown in Fig. 1. is to a good approximation constant (to $3.4 \pm 0.4\,\%$), whereas the background (high-field) magneto-resistance may change by as much as an order of magnitude. Secondly, the sign change of the TMR from a positive value at $V_g = -3.1\,\mathrm{V}$ to a negative one at $V_g = -3.3\,\mathrm{V}$ is not accompanied by a change in the background S. In fact, all possible sign combinations of S and TMR have been observed. Because the low-field TMR signal bears no correlation with the background magneto-resistance, we can exclude a stray-field effect from the contacts to the bulk nanotube as the source of the observed hysteretic signal.

Control Experiment In order to ensure that the measured TMR is caused by a coherent spin polarised current, we have also analysed two devices with asymmetric contacts. One contact (F) is made from the ferromagnetic PdNi alloy of similar composition as it was used in the F-SWNT-F devices and the other (N) from the non-ferromagnetic metal Pd. This yields a N-SWNT-F device, which ideally should display no hysteretic signal. Based on the noise signal of the resistance measurement a hysteretic switching signal (if any) must be smaller than $1 - 1.5\,\%$ (supplementary online material, Fig. S1). Because this is up to 10 times smaller than what we have observed in the F-SWNT-F device for similar conductances,

any magnetic artefact arising from a single ferromagnetic contact alone must be small, proving that we have observed a spin effect in transport in the F-SWNT-F case.

Received xx June 2005

References

1. Wolf, S. A., Awschalom, D. D. & Buhrman, R. A. *et al. Science* **294**, 1488-95 (2001).

2. Zorpette, G. *IEEE Spectrum* **39**, 30-5 (2001).

3. Zutic, I., Fabian, J. & Das Sarma, S. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **76**, 323-410 (2004).

4. Jullière, M. *Phys. Lett.* **54A**, 225-6 (1975).

5. Slonczewski, J. C. *Phys. Rev. B* **39**, 69957002 (1989)

6. Moodera, J. S., Kinder, L. R., Wong, T. M. & Meservey, R. Large Tunnel Junctions *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 3273-6 (1995).

7. Baibich, M. N., Broto, J. M., Fert, A., Nguyen van Dau, F. & Petroff, F. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 2472-5 (1988).

8. Binasch, G., Grünberg, P., Saurenbach, F. & Zinn, W. *Phys. Rev. B* **39**, 4828-30 (1989).

9. George, J. M., Pereira, L. G., Barthelemy, A. *et al. Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 408-11 (1994).

10. Datta, S. & Das, B. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **56**, 665-7 (1990).

11. Schäpers, Th., Nitta, J., Heersche, H. B. & Takayanagi, H. *Phys. Rev. B* **64**, 125314 (2000).

12. Tsukagoshi, K., Alphenaar, B. W. & Ago, H. *Nature* **401**, 572-4 (1999).

13. Tedrow, P. M. & Meservey, R. *Phys. Rev. B* **7**, 31826 (1973).

14. Zhao, B., Mönch, I., Vinzelberg, H., Mühl, T. & Schneider, C. M. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **80**, 3144-6 (2002).

15. Tans, S. J., Devoret, M. H., Dai, H., Thess, A., Smalley, R. E., Geerligs, L. J. & Dekker, C. *Nature* **386**, 474-7 (1997).

16. Bockrath, M., Cobden, D. H., McEuen, P. L., Chopra, N. G., Zettl, A., Thess, A. & Smalley, R. E. *Science* **275**, 1922-5 (1997).

17. Liang, W., Bockrath, M., Bozovic, D., Hafner, J. H., Tinkham, M. & Park, H. *Nature* **411**, 665-9 (2001).

18. Kong, J., Yenilmez, E., Tombler, T. W., Kim, W. & Dai, H. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 106801 (2001).

19. Buitelaar, M. R., Bachtold, A., Nussbaumer, T., Iqbal, M. & Schönenberger, C. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 156801 (2002).

20. Sahoo, S., Kontos, T., Schönenberger C. & Sürgers, C. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **86**, 112109 (2005).

21. Bychkov, Yu. A., Rashba, E. I. *J. Phys. C* **17**, 6039-45 (1984).

22. Nitta, J., Akazaki, T., Takayanagi, H. & Enoki, T. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **78**, 1335-8 (1997).

23. Cobden, D. H., Bockrath, M., McEuen, P. L., Rinzler, A. G. & Smalley, R. E. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 681-4 (1998).

24. De Martino, A. & Egger, R. *J. Phys. Cond. Matter* **7**, 5523 (2005).

25. Barnas, J., Martinek, J., Michalek, G., Bulka, B. R. & Fert, A. *Phys. Rev. B* **62**, 1236373 (2000)

26. Brataas, A., Nazarov, Yu. V., & Bauer, G. E. W. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2481-4 (2000).

27. Waintal, X., Myers, E. B., Brouwer, P. W. & Ralph, D. C. *Phys. Rev.* B **62**, 12317 (2000).

28. Braun, M., König, J. & Martinek, J. *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 195345 (2004).

29. Tsymbal, E. Y., Sokolov, A., Sabirianov, I. F. & Doudin, B. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 186602 (2003).

30. Javey, A., Guo, J., Wang, Q., Lundstrom, M. & Dai, H. *Nature* **424**, 654-7 (2003).

Supplementary Online Material Figure 1S is available at ...

Acknowledgments We acknowledge fruitful discussions with R. Allenspach, W. Belzig, R. Egger, and H. S. J. van der Zant. We thank L. Forró for providing the MWNTs. This work has been supported by the EU RTN network DIENOW, the Swiss National Center (NCCR) on nano-scale science, and the Swiss National Science Foundation.

Author Information Reprints and permissions information is available at npg.nature.com/reprintsandpermissions. The authors declare no competing financial interests. Correspondence and request for materials should be addressed to C.S. (christian.schoenenberger@unibas.ch)

Figure 1 | The tunneling magnetoresistance TMR changes sign with gate voltage V_g.
Inset: SEM picture of a carbon nanotube contacted to ferromagnetic PdNi strips. The separation between the contacts along the nanotube amounts to $L = 400\,\mathrm{nm}$. The magnetic field H was applied in plane. No qualitative difference has been seen for the field direction parallel and perpendicular to the long axis of the ferromagnetic electrodes.
Main panel: Linear response resistance R as a function of magnetic field H at $T = 1.85\,\mathrm{K}$ for different gate voltages V_g. The blue (red) arrow indicates the up (down) magnetic field sweep direction, respectively. The observed amplitude and the sign of the TMR depend on V_g, but not on the high field magnetoresistance (MR), which is expressed by S denoting the percentage change of the MR with magnetic field (see methods). We note, that we extract the maximum possible value for the TMR signal as indicated in the figure.

Figure 2 | The TMR of the device shown in figure 1 oscillates with gate volte V_g.

a TMR as a function of gate voltage V_g at $T = 1.85\,\mathrm{K}$. The characteristic gate voltage scale ΔV_g^{TMR} of the observed TMR modulation varies between 0.4 and $0.75\,\mathrm{V}$. The bars reflect the error in deducing the TMR signal from $R(B)$ curves, see Fig. 1.

b,c This data was measured in a different cryostat at $300\,\mathrm{mK}$: **b** non-linear differential conductance dI/dV as a function of source-drain V_{sd} and gate voltage V_g in a narrow V_g interval, corresponding to the addition of 6 electrons; and **c** the linear conductance G over a much wider V_g interval.

Figure 3 | The detailed evolution of the TMR signal for two single-particle resonances. Results for a SWNT device with a contact separation of $L = 500\,\text{nm}$ measured at $T = 1.85\,\text{K}$. **a** Measurement (■) of the linear conductance G and the TMR around two resonances, and theoretical fit (solid curves) using Eq. (1) with $P = 0.2$, $\kappa = 0.32\,\text{meV}$ and $\gamma_L = 0.014\,(0.028)\,\text{meV}$ and $\gamma_R = 0.5\,(0.85)\,\text{meV}$ for the left (right) resonance, respectively. The bars in Fig. 3a reflect the error in deducing the TMR signal from $R(B)$ curves.

b Plot of the non-linear differential conductance dI/dV as a function of source-drain V_{sd} and gate voltage V_g. Typical $R(B)$ curves for this F-SWNT-F are shown in Fig. S1 (supplementary online material), as are two representative $R(B)$ curves for N-SWNT-F devices.

Figure 4 | Schematics explaining the observed sign change of the TMR.

a Depicts the case for antiparallel and **b** for parallel magnetisation. The electric resistance of an asymmetric resonant-tunneling junction (we assume $\Gamma_R >> \Gamma_L$) is proportional to the asymmetry $A := \Gamma_R/\Gamma_L$, where $\Gamma_{R,L}$ are the tunneling rates to the right (R) and left (L) electrode, respectively. If ferromagnetic contacts are used, $\Gamma_{R,L}$ become spin-dependent. The rate is increased for the spin direction of the majority carriers, whereas it is decreased for the minority ones. The two spin-directions are colour-coded (red $=$ up spin and blue $=$ down spin). Because the electric resistance is spin-dependent, the total resistance R is the parallel circuit of $R^{\uparrow}$ and $R^{\downarrow}$. Whereas $R^{\uparrow}$ and $R^{\downarrow}$ are equal in the parallel configuration, $R^{\uparrow}$ is smaller and $R^{\downarrow}$ is larger in the antiparallel configuration. Due to the dominance of the smaller resistance in a parallel circuit, R is smaller in the antiparallel as compared to the parallel case, corresponding to a *negative* TMR signal.

This figure "Fig1-a.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0511078v1

This figure "Fig1S-a.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0511078v1

This figure "Fig2-a.gif" is available in "gif" format from:
http://arXiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0511078v1

This figure "Fig3-a.gif" is available in "gif" format from:
http://arXiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0511078v1

This figure "Fig4-a.gif" is available in "gif" format from:
http://arXiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0511078v1